How to Predict an Election

Nassim Nicholas Taleb
Tandon School of Engineering, New York University
March 2017

arXiv:1703.06351v1 [q-fin.PR] 18 Mar 2017



Fig. 1. Election arbitrage "estimation" (i.e., valuation) at different expected proportional votes $Y \in [0,1]$, with s the expected volatility of Y between present and election results. We can see that under higher uncertainty, the estimation of the result gets closer to .5, and becomes insensitive to estimated electoral margin.

***Abstract*—We consider the estimation of binary election outcomes as martingales and propose an arbitrage pricing when one continuously updates estimates. We argue that the estimator needs to be priced as a binary option as the arbitrage valuation minimizes the conventionally used Brier score for tracking the accuracy of probability assessors.**

We create a dual martingale process Y, in $[L, H]$ from the standard arithmetic Brownian motion, X in $(-\infty, \infty)$ and price elections accordingly. The dual process Y can represent the numerical votes needed for success.

We show the relationship between the volatility of the estimator in relation to that of the underlying variable. When there is a high uncertainty about the final outcome, 1) the arbitrage value of the binary gets closer to 50%, 2) the estimate should not undergo large changes even if polls or other bases show significant variations.

There are arbitrage relationships between 1) the binary value, 2) the estimation of Y, 3) the volatility of the estimation of Y over the remaining time to expiration. We note that these arbitrage relationships were often violated by the various forecasting groups in the U.S. presidential elections of 2016, as well as the notion that all intermediate assessments of the success of a candidate need to be considered, not just the final one.

Consider a repetition of the Abstract as introduction.

I. Main result

Notation

Y_0: the observed estimated proportion of votes expressed in $[0,1]$ at time t_0.



Fig. 2. X is an open non observable random variable (a shadow variable of sorts) on $\mathbb{R}$, Y, its mapping into "votes" or "electoral votes" via a sigmoidal function $S(.)$, which maps one-to-one, and the binary as the expected value of either using the proper corresponding distribution.

T: period when the irrevocable final elections outcome Y_T are revealed, or expiration.
t_0: present evaluation period, hence $T - t_0$ is fraction (years) of the time until final elections.
s: annualized volatility of Y, or uncertainty attending outcomes for Y in the remaining time until expiration. We assume s is constant without any loss of generality –but it could be time dependent.
$B(.)$: "forecast probability" or estimated continuous-time arbitrage evaluation of the election results, establishing arbitrage bounds between $B(.)$, Y_0 and the volatility s.

Result

$$B(Y_0, \sigma, t_0, T) = \frac{1}{2}\text{erfc}\left(\frac{l - \text{erf}^{-1}(2y-1)e^{\sigma^2 T - t_0}}{\sqrt{e^{2\sigma^2 T - t_0} - 1}}\right) \quad (1)$$

where

$$\sigma \approx \frac{\sqrt{\log\left(2\pi k s^2 e^{2\text{erf}^{-1}(2Y_0-1)^2} + 1\right)}}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{T - t_0}} \quad (2)$$

We find it adequate to answer here upfront the usual comment by statisticians and people operating outside of mathematical finance on "why not simply use a Beta-style distribution for Y?". The answer is that 1) the main purpose of the paper is establishing (arbitrage-free) time consistency in binary forecasts, and 2) we are not aware of a continuous time stochastic process that accommodates a beta distribution and similarly bounded conventional distributions.

Organization

The remaining parts of the paper is organized as follows. First, we argue on why a martingale valuation corresponds to minimizing the Brier Score, the conventional standard in the forecasting industry. Second, we show the process for Y, which can be generalized to other applications. Finally we derive the arbitrage relationships in Equation 1.

II. De Finetti's Probability Assessor



Fig. 3. The instantaneous volatility of Y as a function of the level of Y. We compare to the quadratic form $y - y^2$ scaled by a constant $\frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{\frac{8\pi}{2}}}$. The volatility declines as we move away from $\frac{1}{2}$ and collapses at the edges, thus maintaining Y in $(0, 1)$. For simplification we assumed $\sigma = t = 1$.

A brief background of probability assessment. De Finetti [1] has shown that the "assessment" of the "probability" of the realization of a random variable $\in \{0, 1\}$ requires a nonlinear loss function –which makes his definition of *probabilistic assessment* differ from that of the P/L of a trader engaging in binary bets.

Assume that a betting agent in an n-repeated two period model, t_0 and t_1, produces a strategy $\mathfrak{S}$ of bets indexed by $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$: $b_{0,i} \in [0, 1]$, with the realization of the r.v. $\mathbb{1}_{t_1,i}$. If we take the absolute variations of his P/L over n bets, it will be

$$L_1(\mathfrak{S}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \mathbb{1}_{t_1,i} - b_{t_0,i} \right| .$$

For example, assume that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{t_1}) = \frac{1}{2}$. A betting on the probability, here $\frac{1}{2}$, produces a loss of $\frac{1}{2}$ in expectation, which is the same as betting either 0 or 1 –hence not favoring the agent for betting on the exact probability.



Fig. 4. Process and Dual Process

If we work with the same random variable and non-time-varying probabilities, the L^1 metric would work:

$$L_1(\mathfrak{S}) = \frac{1}{n} \left| \mathbb{1}_{t_1,i} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{t_0,i} \right| .$$

De Finetti proposed a "Brier score" type function, a quadratic loss function in L^2:

$$L_2(\mathfrak{S}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbb{1}_{t_1,i} - b_{t_0,i})^2,$$

the minimum of which is reached for $b_{t_0,i} = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{t_1})$.

In our world of continuous time derivatives valuation, where, in place of a two period lattice model, we are interested, for the same final outcome at t_1, in the stochastic process $b_t, t_0 \geq t \geq t_1$, the arbitrage "value" of a bet on a binary outcome needs to correspond to the expectation, hence, again, map to the Brier score –*by an arbitrage argument*. Although there is no quadratic loss function involved, the fact that the bet is a function of a martingale, which is required to be itself a martingale, namely that the conditional expectation remains invariant to time, should not allow an arbitrage to take place. The consistency between bets at period t and other periods $t + \Delta t$ enforce the probabilistic discipline. In other words, someone can buy from the forecaster then sell back to him, generating a positive expected return if the forecaster is out of line with martingale valuation.

Now elections. We have noticed that although some election forecasters appear aware of the need to minimize their Brier Score, the idea that the revisions of estimates should also be subjected to martingale valuation is not well established.

III. Bounded Dual Martingale Process

Y_T is the terminal value of a process on election date. It lives in $[0, 1]$ but can be generalized to the broader $[L, H]$, $L, H \in [0, \infty)$. The threshold for a given candidate to win is fixed at l. Y can correspond to raw votes, electoral votes, or any other metric. We assume that there is Y_t an intermediate realization of the process, either produced synthetically from polls (corrected estimates) or other such systems.

Next, we create, for an unbounded arithmetic stochastic process, a bounded "dual" stochastic process using a sigmoidal transformation. As fig. 2 shows, it can be helpful to map processes such as a bounded electoral process off a regular Brownian motion, or to map bounded payoffs to an unbounded one.

Remark 1. *Under sigmoidal style transformations* $S : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ *of the form a)* $\frac{1}{1+\exp(-x)}$*, or b)* $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}erf(x)$*, if* X *is a martingale,* Y *is only a martingale for* $Y_0 = \frac{1}{2}$*, and if* Y *is a martingale,* X *is only a martingale for* $X_0 = 0$ *.*

Proof. The proof is summarized as follows. Using Ito's lemma that the drift term for dX_t becomes 1) $\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \text{Tanh}\left(\frac{x(t)}{2}\right)$, or 2) $\sigma^2 X_t$ respectively with transformations of the forms a) and b) under a martingale for Y. And the drift for dY_t becomes: 1) $\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 y(y-1)(2y-1)$ or 2) $\frac{\sigma^2 e^{-\text{erf}^{-1}(2y-1)^2}\text{erf}^{-1}(2y-1)}{\sqrt{\pi}}$ under a martingale for Y. □

We therefore select the case of Y being a martingale. We present the details of the transformation b). The properties of the process have been developed in Carr [2]. Let X be an arithmetic Brownian motion, with X-dependent drift and constant scale σ:

$$dX_t = \sigma^2 X_t dt + \sigma dW_t, 0 < t < T < +\infty \tag{3}$$

We note that this has similarities with the Ornstein-Ullenbeck process normally written $dX_t = \theta(\mu - X_t)dt + \sigma dW$, except that we have $\mu = 0$ and violate the rules by using a negative mean reversion coefficient, rather more adequately described "mean repelling", $\theta = -\sigma^2$.

We map from $X \in (-\infty, \infty)$ to Y its dual process as follows. With $S : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$, $Y = S(x)$,

$$S(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\text{erf}(x) \tag{4}$$

the dual process (by unique transformation since S is one to one, becomes, for $y \triangleq S(x)$, using Ito's lemma (since $S(.)$ is twice differentiable):

$$dS = \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial x^2} + X\sigma^2 \frac{\partial S}{\partial x}\right) \mathrm{d}t + \sigma \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} dW$$

which can be written as a process

$$dY_t = s(Y, t)dW \tag{5}$$

with zero drift, for all $t > \tau, \mathbb{E}(Y_t|Y_\tau) = Y_\tau$. and scale

$$s(Y, t) = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\text{erf}^{-1}(2y-1)^2}$$

which we saw in Figure 3 can be approximated by the quadratic function $y(1 - y)$.

We can recover Equation 3 by inverting, namely $S^{-1}(y) = \text{erf}^{-1}(2y - 1)$, and repeating Ito's lemma. The consequence of the gauge invariance is identity of option prices whether priced on X or Y, even if a process has a drift, not the other. In other words, one may apply one's estimation to the electoral threshold or to the more complicated X with same results.

1) Comment on closed form solutions: We note that, for Y, we lack a closed form solution for the integral reflecting the total variations: $\int_{t_0}^{T} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\text{erf}^{-1}(2y_s-1)^2} ds$, though the corresponding one for X is computable. Hence we can use propagation of uncertainty methods. We have closed form solution for the probability density of Y, though not explicitly its moments –as the logistic normal integral does not lend itself to simple expansions [3].

2) Time Slice Distributions for X and Y: The time slice distribution, or probability density function for moment t, that is the one-period representation, starting at t with $y_0 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\text{erf}(x_0)$ (or vice versa):

For X: X is normally distributed for a period $T - t_0$ with

$$\mathbb{E}(X, T) = X_0 e^{\sigma^2 (T - t_0)}$$

and

$$\mathbb{V}(X, T) = \frac{e^{2\sigma^2 (T-t_0)} - 1}{2}$$

and a kurtosis of 3. By probability transformation to get φ the distribution of Y with initial value Y_0:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(y; y_0, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{e^{2\sigma^2(T-t_0)} - 1}} \exp\Bigg(&\text{erf}^{-1}(2y-1)^2 \\ &- \frac{1}{2}\left(\coth\left(\sigma^2 t\right) - 1\right)\Big(\text{erf}^{-1}(2y-1) \\ &- \text{erf}^{-1}(2y_0 - 1)e^{\sigma^2(T-t_0)}\Big)^2\Bigg)\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

We have $\mathbb{E}(Y_t) = Y_0$.

As to the variance, $\mathbb{E}(Y^2)$, as mentioned above, does not lend itself to a closed-form solution derived from $\varphi(.)$, nor from the stochastic integral; but it can be easily estimated from the closed form distribution of X using methods of propagation of uncertainty for the first two moments (hence the delta method).

Since the variance of a function f of a finite moment random variable X can be approximated as $V(f(X)) = f'(\mathbb{E}(x))^2 V(X)$:

$$\frac{\partial S^{-1}(y)}{y}|_{y=Y_0} s^2 \approx \frac{e^{2\sigma^2(T-t_0)} - 1}{2}$$

$$s \approx \sqrt{\frac{e^{-2\text{erf}^{-1}(2Y_0-1)^2}\left(e^{2\sigma^2(T-t_0)} - 1\right)}{2\pi}} \tag{7}$$

Likewise for calculations in the opposite direction, we find

$$\sigma \approx \frac{\sqrt{\log\left(2\pi k s^2 e^{2\text{erf}^{-1}(2Y_0-1)^2} + 1\right)}}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{T - t_0}}$$

which is Equation 2 in the presentation of the main result.

Note that expansions including higher moments do not bring a material increase in precision –although S is highly nonlinear around the center, the range of values for the volatility of the total or, say, the electoral college is too low to affect higher order terms in a significant way, in addition to the boundedness of the sigmoid-style transformations.



Fig. 5. Shows the estimation process cannot be in sync with the volatility of the estimation of (electoral or other) votes as it violates arbitrage boundaries

3) A Discussion on Risk Neutrality: We apply risk neutral valuation, for lack of conviction for another way, as a default option. Although Y may not necessarily be tradable, adding a risk premium for the process involved in determining the arbitrage valuation would necessarily implies a negative one for the other candidate(s), which is hard to justify. Further, options, being binary bets, need to satisfy Dutch Book arguments. Finally, any departure from risk neutrality would depart from the optimum Brier Score as it would represent a diversion from the final forecast.

Also note the absence of the assumptions of financial usually present in financial discussions.

IV. The Bachelier valuation

Let $F(.) \in \mathbf{C^2}$ be a function of the variable X in Equation 3.

We need to show that X has simple Bachelier option price $B(.)$. The idea of no arbitrage is that a continuously made forecast must itself be a martingale of sorts. Apply the standard no arbitrage argument:

$$\mathrm{d}F - \frac{\partial F}{\partial X}\mathrm{d}X = 0 \tag{8}$$

Adding to Equation 3, we end up with the partial differential equation:

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}\mathrm{dt} = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial X^2}\sigma^2. \tag{9}$$

For a binary (call) option, we have for terminal conditions $B(X,t) \triangleq F, F|_{t\to T} = \theta(x-l)$, where $\theta(.)$ is the Heaviside theta function and l is the threshold:

$$\theta(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & x \geq l; \\ 0, & x < l \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

with initial conditions x_0 at time t_0 and terminal condition T:

$$B(x_0, t_0, T) = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \mathrm{Erf}\left(\frac{l - x_0 e^{\sigma^2 t}}{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{(T-t_0)}\sigma}\right)\right) \tag{11}$$

which is, simply, the survival function of the Normal distribution parametrized under the process for X.

Likewise we note from the earlier argument of one-to one (one can use Borel set arguments) that

$$\theta(y) := \begin{cases} 1, & y \geq S(l); \\ 0, & y < S(l) \end{cases}$$

so we can price the alternative process $B(Y,t) = \mathbb{P}(Y > \frac{1}{2})$ (or any other similarly obtained threshold l, by pricing

$$B(Y_0, t_0) = \mathbb{P}(x > S^{-1}(l)).$$

The pricing from the proportion of votes:

$$B(Y_0, \sigma, t_0, T) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{erfc}\left(\frac{l - \mathrm{erf}^{-1}(2Y_0 - 1)e^{\sigma^2(T-t_0)}}{\sqrt{e^{2\sigma^2(T-t_0)} - 1}}\right)$$

the main Equation 1, which can also be expressed less conveniently as

$$B(Y, \sigma, t_0, T) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{e^{2\sigma^2(T-t_0)} - 1}} \int_K^1 \exp\left(\left(\frac{2v-1}{\mathrm{erf}}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\coth\left(\sigma^2(T-t_0)\right) - 1\right)\left(\frac{2v-1}{\mathrm{erf}} - \frac{(2Y_0 - 1)e^{\sigma^2(T-t_0)}}{\mathrm{erf}}\right)^2\right) dv \tag{12}$$

V. Conclusion and Comments

As can be seen in Figure 1, a binary option reveals more about uncertainty than about the true estimation, a result well known to traders, see [4].

In the presence of more than 2 candidates, the process can be generalized in the following manner. Establish the stochastic process for $Y_{1,t}$, and just as $Y_{1,t}$ is a process in $[0,1]$, $Y_{2,t}$ is a process $\in (Y_{1,t}, 1]$, with $Y_{3,t}$ the residual $1 - Y_{2,t} - Y_{1,t}$, and more generally $Y_{n-1,t} \in (Y_{n_2,t}, 1]$ and $Y_{n,t}$ is the residual $Y_n = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} Y_{i,t}$. More generally, for n candidates, the n^{th} is the residual.



Fig. 6. Parameter β for $S(x)$



Fig. 7. Parameter β for $S^{-1}(x)$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I thank particularly Andrew Lesnievski, Peter Carr, and Raphael Douady for detailed and extensive discussions of the paper as well as thorough auditing of the proofs across the various iterations of this paper, and, worse, the numerous changes of notation. All errors are mine. I thank David Shimko and Andrew Papanicolaou for comments. I thank Arthur Breitman for guidance with the literature for numerical approximations of the various logistic-normal integrals. I thank participants of the Tandon School of Engineering and Bloomberg Quantitative Finance Seminars. I also thank Raphael Bruno Dupire, Mike Lawler, and friendly people on twitter ...

I note that Dhruv Madeka from Bloomberg while working on a similar problem independently came up with the same conclusion concerning the volatility of an estimate and its bounds.

REFERENCES

[1] B. De Finetti, *Philosophical Lectures on Probability: collected, edited, and annotated by Alberto Mura*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008, vol. 340.

[2] P. Carr, "Bounded brownian motion," *NYU Tandon School of Engineering*, 2017.

[3] D. Pirjol, "The logistic-normal integral and its generalizations," *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 237, no. 1, pp. 460–469, 2013.

[4] N. N. Taleb, *Dynamic Hedging: Managing Vanilla and Exotic Options*. John Wiley & Sons (Wiley Series in Financial Engineering), 1997.

[5] G. E. Crooks, "Logistic approximation to the logistic-normal integral," *Technical Report Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory*, 2009.

APPENDIX

The various forms of sigmoidal transformations $S : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ can be numerically substituted for one another with minor differences (not practical enough for our case). Hence $\frac{1}{1+\exp\left(-\frac{x_0}{\beta}\right)}$ can be substituted for $\frac{1}{2} + \text{erf}(x_0)$. We compare to [5] for whom $\beta \approx \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{4}$ and find better fit across values of x. See also [3] for more precise expansions.

First consider

$$\beta_{n_1} = \left\{ \beta : \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(-\frac{x_0}{\beta}\right)} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\text{erf}(x_0)}{2}; x_0 \in (-\infty, +\infty) \right\},$$

hence:

$$\beta_{n_1} = \frac{x_0}{\log\left(\frac{-\text{erf}(x_0)-1}{\text{erf}(x_0)-1}\right)} \tag{13}$$

And $\beta_{n_2} = \left\{ \beta : \beta \log\left(-\frac{y_0}{y_0-1}\right) = \text{erf}^{-1}(2y_0 - 1) \right\}$

$$\beta_{n_2} = \frac{\text{erf}^{-1}(2y_0 - 1)}{\log\left(-\frac{y_0}{y_0-1}\right)} \tag{14}$$

We end up, as seen on Figure 6 an acceptable fit with $\beta_n \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$.